

Mr. BUMPERS. I have a chart here, and you will see those savings not only involve the savings for 1994, they involve, for example, the space station, which is only \$2 billion in 1994, but you are looking at \$33 billion to build that sucker, and we do not even have a plan. I said during the debate on the space station, I believe I could walk on the floor of the U.S. Senate and say, "Senators, I've got bad news for you. We've spent \$8 billion so far and are getting ready to spend another \$2 billion and there is no such thing. We don't have a plan, don't have a clue. There is no such thing." If that had been true, I do not believe I would have gotten an additional vote, not one.

This body was just hell-bent on spending the money for the space station and nobody could stop it—me, nobody else. But now I am getting ahead of myself again.

So in 1983, in all fairness to President Reagan, he said I will balance the budget in 1983, no later than 1994.

Now, while the Senator has correctly said that money cannot be spent unless Congress authorizes it and appropriates it, there is one sentence he neglected to add. That is, you cannot spend a penny in this country until the President signs off on it—"R. Reagan," "R.R. Reagan," "Ronald R. Reagan," whatever it takes to sign the bill. All he had to do was use that awesome constitutional power to veto any spending bill that he thought was going to add to the deficit.

I can tell you at that time, considering his popularity and the hostility of the voters of this country, nobody would have overridden the veto. But he did not do that. He did not veto a single spending bill, not one.

Then he began to say what we need is a line-item veto. Well, a line-item veto may not be the worst idea in the world, but it certainly shifts a tremendous amount of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch. I do not mind saying here, I have strongly encouraged the President to send a very big rescission bill over here and to say to you people, I do not want to spend this money, and if you want me to spend it, you are going to have to vote again on it.

I think it would be a healthy thing for him to do. And, incidentally, there are a lot of rumblings now that he is going to do that.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAIG. The question is, late this month or early next month the Senate will have an opportunity to work with the House and the American people to change the environment in which this process that the Senator and I are both concerned about operates. It is known as a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget. We will have that vote in this Chamber. How does the Senator plan to vote?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, you Republicans keep anticipating me. I am getting to that.

Mr. CRAIG. All right. The question will be how will the Senator from Arkansas plan to vote on that important issue?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am going to tell the Senator something. I am a little ambivalent. I have been strongly opposed to a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and I wish we had a couple of hours for a colloquy on that subject.

While I certainly favor anything that will bring some constraints on the Congress, I have never been able to figure out how a constitutional amendment will work at the Federal level. It was easy in the State of Arkansas.

Incidentally, I will give you a little lesson in 103-A Arkansas economics. We had biennial budgeting. We budgeted 2 years at a time. I do not think biennial budgeting would be a bad idea for Congress. The President, who succeeded Senator PRYOR and me as Governor of Arkansas, also believes that biennial budgeting may have some merit.

But the other thing we did, we put funding for every program in classes A, B and C. We got a projection as to how much income we were going to have next year and the following year. We would take 80 percent of those figures and put it in category A. Now, we might put 90 percent in as far as education was concerned. Then we said, if projections are more than that, the additional amount of money goes in category B. If you get more than that, the additional amount goes in category C. Very seldom was much if anything funded under category C.

It was a magnificent system, to not spend more than you took in, and we never had to worry about the Constitution providing for a balanced budget amendment.

Now, if I could get all the Members of the Senate to vote for something like that, I might vote for a balanced budget amendment. But just to raise the question—and then I wish to get on with this show—just to raise the question about a balanced budget amendment, let us assume we go home. We have made a projection. We have appropriated money based on how much money we think we are going to have this year. All of a sudden, after we have patted ourselves on the back, given ourselves the good-Government award and gone home, we find ourselves with an economy that is collapsing.

Then you have to come back and, under the proposals that are being offered around here, vote by a three-fifths or two-thirds vote to spend money you do not have—deficit spending.

Now, what does that mean? That means a very small minority of people in the Senate can block it, no matter how critical the needs are, no matter if people are hungry and in the streets, as a lot of them are.

You are looking at somebody who can remember the Depression. I was

just a youngster. But I can tell you it had a traumatic influence on me, and it certainly had a traumatic influence on my parents who were trying to put food on the table.

But I do not want to debate that. We are going to bring that bill up and we are going to debate it here.

Anyway, in 1984, the President said we need a line-item veto. In 1985, he said we need a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. In 1986, he said, you know, I cannot spend a nickel that Congress does not appropriate.

We have been through all that. I am not putting the onus on Ronald Reagan, but for the life of me, I have never understood why on Earth he did not use the veto power which he had to discipline Congress, just as I and DAVID PRYOR did when we were Governors of our State. Oftentimes, I did not have to veto a bill because I told them, you put that sucker on my desk and I am going to veto it; or, if you do not take this provision out, I am going to veto it; or, if you do not put this provision in, I am going to veto it. That is all I usually had to do, and that is all the President of the United States would have to do.

So, Mr. President, you are talking about the east coast distributor and the southwest coast distributor for balanced budgets, and for 4 consecutive years I have come to the floor of the Senate and offered a series of spending cuts.

The result is on that chart. That is this year. But the preceding 3 years are not much different. In 1993, in August, when we were debating the bill to cut the deficit, yes, it included taxes. Do you think I voted for that bill because I love to raise people's taxes and go home and say, you lucky dogs, I just voted to raise your taxes?

Do you know the one thing every politician wants more than anything else? Of course you do. It is to be reelected. Do you know the best way to not get reelected? Vote to raise somebody's taxes.

So, no, I did not enjoy going home and making that presentation. Do you think I enjoy telling the elderly we are going to tax more of your Social Security?

I can tell you what I enjoy a great deal less, and that is saying the deficit is out of control and we are not doing a thing about it. I hope things turn out OK for you.

I know the Chamber of Commerce speeches. I made my share of them. You tell them everything they want to hear. Do not talk about things you do not want to talk about. They are not privy to what is going on here; most of them are busy making a living. They do not know you voted to torpedo the space station or did not vote to torpedo the space station. They do not know how you voted on SDI. They do not know how you voted on the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor; they never heard of it.

They do not know how you voted on the intelligence budget. They think in-

telligence is a pretty good idea even though the budget is almost as big as it was at the height of the cold war and they want more money. They say there are terrorists in this world; we have to have more money. If you cannot deal with terrorism with the kind of money we are spending on intelligence, you are not going to do it with any more than you are already spending.

National Endowment for Democracy, that was almost laughable when I offered it. I have always opposed it. Only \$35 million. But you project that one out 35 years, at interest of 4½ percent, and that is what you have to do because we are borrowing every penny of it, \$2.2 billion. As Senator Everett Dirksen said, it soon runs into money, does it not?

But just go through the chart, and then I invite you to recall all of those speeches you heard back in August, and I was naive enough even after I have been here 19 years to believe that the people making those speeches were serious. I cannot vote for the President's deficit reduction package because it does not cut enough spending. They wore badges saying, "Cut Spending First." I remember when Gerald Ford was President. The WIN buttons; everybody wore a WIN button, "Whip Inflation Now". You do not whip inflation with a button. And you do not cut spending by wearing a button either. You cut spending by having the courage to walk on the floor of the U.S. Senate and voting to cut spending.

The Senator from North Carolina correctly pointed out that entitlements have been running out of control. They have indeed. But entitlements means a lot of things. When you talk about entitlements to the Chamber of Commerce they think of some worthless no good so and so on welfare. Well, I am for cutting him off. But it includes Social Security; it includes Medicare, it includes Medicaid; it includes food stamps; it includes cost-of-living increases for Social Security recipients; it includes a whole host of things.

So instead of people talking about entitlements, let us get specific. I said, let us torpedo the super collider. We did not have the courage to do it. The House did it. We debated that thing all day long here. And I got 42 votes, which I must say is 10 more than I got last year. So there is some change going on here.

That will save \$39 billion over the next 35 years. I heard people on the floor of the Senate say, well, anybody who thinks that \$640 million for 1994 is going to balance the budget is just crazy. We are not talking about \$640 million in 1994. We are talking about a project which has gone from \$4 billion to \$13 billion in the past few years. And Lord knows where it will wind up.

We are talking about \$39 billion. And the space station, you may get a chance to vote on that again before the Sun goes down today, Senator. I understand the Senator from Texas has an

amendment to the bill to cut administrative expenses. I think the space station would be nice and neat, and clearly everybody would know what they were voting on. The Senator from Texas proposes to offset the cost of the retroactivity provisions of the tax bill by cutting administrative expenses.

That is kind of like entitlements. You cannot see it; cannot feel it; nobody knows who is hurt or helped by it.

I say if you really want to undo the retroactivity part of the tax bill, why not just offer up the space station? It is more than enough to do the job. And you get rid of a project that is already dead as a doornail. We have not signed it and sealed it and held the funeral.

But you think about the 6, 7 years we have funded the super collider. And everybody knew that all through the super collider was going to be killed. But not until we spent over \$2 billion on it.

Everybody knows that the space station is dead. It is a question of when we are going to bury it. Who here will stand up and say what they are voting on when they vote with the space station?

I was reading Buck Rogers when I was a kid. It is wonderful. Incidentally, NASA's record is not all that hot. We lost 2.3 billion dollars' worth of rockets and satellites in the past 70 days. And \$2.3 billion has blown up. Happily the shuttle was not one of them.

I can tell you, people come in here and vote for \$2.1 billion next year for the space station and do not have a clue about what they are voting on. I do not mean to denigrate my colleagues, but it is a fact. The President does not even know what the space station is going to be. There is no design. There is nothing. You could save right now if you were to cut it right now and leave \$500 million to terminate it.

We are leaving \$640 million to terminate the collider. That is the second big hole in the ground that I had some part in stopping since I have been in the Senate. I can remember the Clinch River Breeder Reactor; 1983, the fourth year I finally killed that one; big hole in the ground; super collider, big hole in the ground. But you cannot ever stop it until they start digging.

The space station, if we keep going—we left \$500 million in the space station this year to terminate it—we would still have cut \$1.6 billion, but you take \$83 billion that it would cost to build it, borrow the money, pay compounded interest on it, you save \$216 billion.

Everything looks so easy now. It is just \$1 billion. It is just a few hundred million dollars. But when you are borrowing the money for every dime you spend and paying interest on it, the figures become staggering.

SDI, we gave up on SDI because it had such a stench in its title. People did not like the smell of it. So they changed it to ballistic missile defense. And you remember how successful our Patriots were in Desert Storm. We are going to change this to theater missile

defense. I do not mind that. But I mind the amount of money we are spending on it.

I tried and successfully—Senator SASSER and I cut \$400 million off the authorization. So far that is about the only success, that is the only cut the Senate has made, \$400 million on the ballistic missile defense program.

The intelligence budget which the Los Angeles Times says is \$28 billion a year, more than 10 countries of NATO spend on their entire defense budget. More than Iran, Iraq, China, and North Korea. Can you believe we spend almost as much on intelligence as France and Britain each spend on its entire defense budget? China? Iraq?

The intelligence community says, well, we have a lot of terrorists in the world. So what is new?

And then the D-5 missile, I want you to think about the D-5 missile. We already have more missiles than are permitted under the START II treaty and still buying them. That is really smart, is it not?

Well, I might not go through all of these, except I want to point out on the super collider the House killed that 280 to 150, but the Senate resurrected it on a vote of 42 to 57. On the space station, the House approved it by one 1, 215 to 216. Do not worry anybody, the Senate will take care of it. We resurrected the space station by a vote of 40 to 59.

The ballistic missile program, that is one we won that I just mentioned a moment ago. The intelligence budget, the House disapproved cutting the intelligence budget by better than 2 to 1. And in this body I lost that one 35 to 64.

The advanced solid rocket motor. The House killed that thing 379-43. Do not worry, House, we resurrected it. We came a little closer, but we lost that one 53-47. That one is dead, too, now because the House happened to refuse to even take it up.

The National Endowment for Democracy. A small amount of money, the House killed it 243-181, but Do not worry, House of Representatives, the good old Senate saved it. We saved you from all of those spending cuts you are trying to get through the House. We voted against cutting that program 23-74.

If it were not too embarrassing, I have a chart I asked my staff to put together on the 17 votes—we have had 17 votes on appropriations that were pure spending cuts—17. Senator DORGAN will be happy to know he is one of four Senators that has a better record than I have on voting for spending cuts.

I am not going to embarrass people who have stood on the floor and talked about what great budget balancers we were. We had one Senator with a zero record. We had a lot of Senators who made those long, patronizing, paternalistic statements about how they love spending cuts more than anything else and voted for about 25 to 30 percent of those cuts.

While I am willing to admit that nobody around here is perfect, everybody votes for a pork project now and then. Pork is still what somebody else gets in his State, not yours.

But when people tell me we need this and we need that, we need the line-item veto and resolutions and a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, what we need are men and women who are committed to the future of this country and our children and who know as well as they know their names where we are headed if we do not come to our senses.

The American people are still upset. They have been upset since 1980. They are still upset. And they have the number of this place.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for a question, I have listened for some while to the Senator, not only today but also on amendments he has offered. One of the interesting things about politics and about our legislative procedure is that no one is likely to have a reception someplace and invite us to come and honor Senator DALE BUMPERS for his work on behalf of cutting Federal spending. If someone is in favor of spending—this spending or that spending, or this group or that group or the other group—it is not unusual to be invited to a reception or banquet honoring that Senator or Congressman, because that person has championed this way or that way to spend money. Nobody is going to hold a banquet for Senator BUMPERS because he took on the interest groups. He tried to cut money from the super collider, the space station, intelligence functions, SDI, D-5, and the advanced solid rocket motor. That is unfortunately the way this system works. It is designed like a giant boulder rolling downhill to spend and spend and spend.

One of the things that is always interesting to me, that I hear everywhere I go, is that the President does not spend money. Anybody who reads history books about the way this country was founded, or who has read the Constitution, understands that Congress spends money. Therefore, Congress is responsible for the deficits.

Well, there is no question about the fact that we are responsible. No question about that. It is our responsibility. But there are joint responsibilities here.

There are three steps to spending a dollar. First, by law, the President requests a Federal budget. He proposes a certain level of spending. Second, the Congress then disposes of those recommendations by determining what to spend. Third, and very important, equal to about two-thirds of the votes of the House and the Senate, the President decides to accept or to veto the budget Congress has passed.

The President has an enormous responsibility in how much gets spent. The Senator from Arkansas has again pointed out to the Members of the Senate that we are going to tackle this issue and begin to cut unnecessary

spending when we quit wearing buttons and start casting votes on the floor of the Senate on specific issues.

Do you think or do you not think that the space station is a waste of money? If you do not think so, fine, vote to keep spending, but do not wear your button anymore. Do not wear a button saying "Cut Spending First" and vote for every conceivable area of public spending when it is in your State.

I think the Senator from Arkansas does an enormous service to the Senate. He has demonstrated with his report card that it is one thing to talk in slogans about spending cuts; it is quite another thing to confront a choice about real spending cuts on real projects.

Obviously, the super collider has now been killed. That was not because of the Senate, but because the House of Representatives flat out killed it. In effect, the House said "Do not send it back because we are not going to pass it."

Does the Senator see progress on some of the other items he has been offering amendments on?

Mr. BUMPERS. I do, indeed. I just do not believe the House is going to accept a bill with the National Endowment for Democracy in there. I do not have anything against democracy, but we spend \$14 billion in foreign aid, and I thought that was to try to promote democracy abroad. Here is a \$35 million boondoggle.

When I debated that on the floor—and I have told this before—I walked off the floor after making a barn-burning speech trying to kill that thing, and somebody said, "Senator, do you know your wife is going to Kazakhstan with a delegation funded with a grant from the National Endowment?"

I said, "Mrs. Bumpers can just stay home. She does not need to go to Kazakhstan anyway, and if we can save \$35 million, I am willing to tell her she cannot go." But I do not think the House is going to approve that. Look at the vote, 243-181. And on the ASRM, I think that is dead. It is already dead.

I will tell you where the biggies are. The space station is the biggest of all. When you look at what that will cost over 35 years, \$216 billion, that is by far the biggest item that we need to get rid of. I am not going to debate the space station. You and I have been on the same side of that issue, and we have talked about it and given it our best shot, and we have simply not prevailed.

Ballistic missile defense. I am not sure that that is a bad idea, but I know that we are spending too much money on research right now. You know, we spent over \$30 billion on SDI before we decided we did not need SDI.

So they changed the name of it to BMD, ballistic missile defense, and conjured up all of those rockets being destroyed by Patriot missiles. Who wants to vote against the Patriot when they watched on the evening television

as that thing supposedly—you and I know that was terribly embellished about the success rate of that. But everybody saw it, and they were patriotic about it.

The intelligence budget is still out of control. I do not want to give him a figure as to what I think the intelligence budget ought to be, but it is terribly bloated at this moment.

As to the D-5 missile, the Senator heard me say a moment ago we already have bought and paid for more missiles and more warheads for our Trident submarines than we are going to be permitted to use under the START II Treaty, which we must come into compliance with around the year 2000. The Senator knows what will happen—the same thing that happened on the super conductor supercollider. I lost that battle this year. Next year I may lose it again. The next year I may win it. And we would have spent all that money needlessly in the meantime.

I am glad they are not digging a hole for the D-5 because they love to dig holes. Everything has a hole—the Clinch River breeder, the super collider. If they were digging a hole they would be down I do not know how deep right now. We all know we have to go back and fill the hole in.

I already mentioned the other two. These figures are slightly embellished. The figure is more than \$450 billion that we could save with those few amendments over the next 35 years.

We never get a chance to vote on the 35-year cost. We vote on that \$500 million for next year or that \$1.5 billion or \$2 billion for next year as though that is just petty cash. We know where it is headed. We know what the ultimate cost is going to be.

Madam President, I am prepared to yield the floor. As I say, I was sitting here waiting for the Senator from Texas to offer her amendment on the retroactivity part of the tax bill and maybe might offer a second-degree amendment or first-degree amendment. But in any event, since the Senator from North Carolina came in and mentioned deficit, he really rang my bell, and I just thought I would get up and make a few points.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for one additional quick question?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I know others wish to speak. I will be brief.

The Senator's amendment on the National Endowment for Democracy was not a case of others trying just to save this program, which is without worth. The Senator from Arkansas was also saying that this program should be killed. But the folks who are recommending more money are saying we should cut everything else—cut programs for kids, cut programs for people who are vulnerable. And we are cutting a whole range of those programs. But they also said the National Endowment for Democracy should be given a very healthy increase in money.

What is the National Endowment for Democracy? The NED takes \$35 million from the American taxpayer, divvies it up, and gives a little bit to the AFL-CIO!

Mr. BUMPERS. Not a little bit.

Mr. DORGAN. Give a big amount.

Mr. BUMPERS. It is a big percentage.

Mr. DORGAN. It also gives a lot to the chamber of commerce, to the Democratic National Party, and to the Republican National Party.

So now we have four groups that benefit by NED: Labor, business, and the two national parties. NED gives them money, millions and millions of dollars, and says to them, "Your mission is to go out into the world and promote democracy."

Talk about a weak case of spending the taxpayers' money. I tell you that the case does not exist. And not only were others telling us to spend that money, but they were also saying in virtually every area of the Federal Government that we must tighten our belt and exercise control. They insist on waiting until it comes to giving money to the chamber of commerce, the AFL-CIO, and the two national political parties. We are then told to give them a lot more money than they used to have.

That is the craziest scheme in the entire Western World.

How many votes did the Senator from Arkansas get from folks wearing "Cut Spending First" buttons? How many votes did the Senator get in the U.S. Senate to cut the National Endowment for Democracy?

Mr. BUMPERS. Twenty-three votes out of one hundred.

Mr. DORGAN. Seventy-four Senators voted not to cut.

Mr. BUMPERS. Incidentally, I will tell the Senator from North Dakota offered his comments on salient, cogent points, that is, nobody around here gets any awards. You do not get a plaque—Lord knows I get plenty of them. I do not go to a chamber of commerce banquet where we do not get a plaque. We get plenty of plaques and little statuettes, and all that sort of thing, honoring us for spending, but there are no groups in this town honoring anybody for cutting spending.

The politics of every issue is with spending. I was going to tell the Senator when you look at all those big-ticket items, the National Endowment for Democracy does not amount to a tin whistle, and yet that was probably the heaviest lobby opposition I ran into of all my amendments. It was the strangest, bizarre thing I ever ran into.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CHIEF OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I am going to change the subject away from the deficit this afternoon, but I would tell the Senator from Arkansas one of the reasons he does not recognize there are groups out there who award you for cutting spending is because he has probably not received a lot of those cut awards because the big money is in a lot of these everyday appropriations bills that grow at the rate of 8 and 10 and 12 percent. About 85 to 90 percent of the big dollar money is there, and if you do not cut the overall size of the Government, then, you bet, \$2 billion sounds like a lot but in the size of a trillion dollar-plus budget, sadly enough, it is a bit of pocket change.

What I would like to talk about for a few moments this afternoon is something that is well under way in the Clinton administration that I think gives great frustration to many of us who have watched over the years an old-line Federal agency be managed by a corps of professional people to assure that it be professional in addressing its responsibilities for the American people.

What I am talking about is the U.S. Forest Service.

Headlines in the Washington Times this morning say "Foresters Balk at Clinton Candidate for Agency Leader."

To my knowledge this is the first time in the history of the United States Forest Service that 69 forest supervisors from 28 States and Puerto Rico wrote the President of the United States to ask him to do something different for the sake and the integrity of the agency that those people are responsible in managing.

On last Friday I became aware of the fact that by all appearances under the new organizational structure of the USDA under the direction of Secretary Mike Espy it appeared that this President was attempting to politicize the appointment of the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service. That would be the first time in the 88-year history of the Forest Service that the Chief was not a professional from inside the ranks of the U.S. Forest Service.

Not only did I in the letter signed along with MARK HATFIELD, the Senator from Oregon, Senator MALCOLM WALLOP from Wyoming, Senator CONRAD BURNS of Montana, asked the Secretary to change his mind, but then came the letter of 70 foresters from across the country asking that that happen.

Probably one of the most disturbing letters came to Assistant Secretary Jim Lyons on the 15th of this month from the former Chief of the Forest Service, R. Max Peterson, who in a 2-page, single spaced letter gave a very critical critique of what appears to be a way to scheme, if you will—let me use the word "scheme" to rearrange the method by which Chiefs of the Forest Service are appointed so that a per-

son who is not in the senior executive service could qualify in that.

I just mention senior executive service. Historically and for all reasons of professionalism and expertise, people who have arrived at the status to be considered for Chief of the U.S. Forest Service have come from the ranks of the senior executive service.

That is something that we as a Congress have promoted, recognizing that these men and women are those who aspired through the ranks of leadership and experience which then provided them with a type of expertise and talent that would offer to this country the quality of leadership that our Government would want.

Not only did a letter come from Max Peterson but a letter from the National Association of State Foresters and probably the most critical and interesting letter came from a fellow who only identifies himself as an employee of the Forest Service, a Louis Romero, who says in his letter to the President on the 15th of October—and he also sent a copy to Dale Robertson, Chief of the Forest Service, and Larry Henson, Regional Forester, Southwestern Region, and Lou Volk, Deputy Regional Forester—he writes this in his closing paragraph:

In my 31 years I have never seen so many proud, competent employees of the Forest Service so demoralized. If our Chief is replaced, I am confident that we will rise to support his successor despite the mood spreading among USDA Forest Service employees from current signals. I am writing you as one of those proud USDA Forest Service employees with an outstanding performance record of serving the agency and our public. I consider myself a student of leadership, who like you, is interested in "doing the right things for the greater good" of our country. I am not some disgruntled employee with a particular "ax" to grind.

It is an extremely well written letter.

I think this is because of a series of actions that occurred since President Clinton took office, an across the board freeze of employees that demoralized any upward movement and now an attempt to politicize the Chief of the Forest Service.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS.

Washington, DC, October 1, 1993.

Hon. JAMES R. LYONS,
Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and
Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: It has come to our attention that the Department is considering replacing Dale Robertson as Chief of the Forest Service. It is our hope that whomever is named to the post should be a qualified professional who has gone through the appropriate civil service qualifications and processes. It should not under any circumstances be a political appointment.

Maintaining a high level of professionalism will be critical in maintaining and restoring the credibility of the Forest Service. Unnec-